

REMARKS

I. Status of the Application

Claims 1-32, 41, 45, 48, and 50-67 are currently pending. Claims 1, 2, 7-11, 17-21, 27-32, 41, 45, and 48 are amended. Claims 50-67 are new. Claims 33-40, 42-44, 46-47 and 49 are cancelled, without prejudice.

II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 33, 35-37, 41-43 and 45 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for allegedly being anticipated over U.S. Patent No. 6,246,871 (“Ala-Laurila”). Claims 33, 35-37, and 42-43 are cancelled. Claims 41 and 45 are amended and the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 41 defines a system for use by an information repository service to enable a user to share desired information with one or more parties. Claim 41 comprises a memory, “maintained by an information repository service,” configured to “store data.” Claim 41 has been amended to comprise “an interface, maintained by the information repository service, configured to receive from an information service provider unaffiliated with the information repository service, (1) information obtained as a result of a search of a website-based information source performed by the information service provider on behalf of a user, and (2) first data identifying the user.” The interface is additionally configured to “receive from the user second data identifying one or more parties authorized to access the information.” Claim 41 has been further amended to comprises a processor, “maintained by the information repository service,” configured to “store the information received from the information service provider and the first data identifying the user, in the memory.” The processor is additionally configured to “convey access data enabling access to the information to the one or more parties” and “allow

access by the one or more parties to the information in the memory based on the access data.”

Support for the amendments to claim 41 is found at pages 10-14, for example.

Claims 45, which depends from amended claim 41, has been amended to conform to the language of amended claim 41.

Ala-Laurila discloses a voice mail method and apparatus for use with a wireless communications network. (Col. 1, lines 65-67). The system includes a network mailbox system that the subscriber may access using a subscriber access code. (Col. 2, lines 1-6). The subscriber can store a temporary message, created by the subscriber or by a third party, in his or her mailbox for distribution to recipients. (Col. 2, lines 6-15). A notification, including an address code allowing access to the mailbox system and a temporary access code allowing access to the stored message in particular, is transmitted to the intended recipients. (Col. 2, lines 16-21). After receiving the notification, the recipients can access the stored message by entering the address code and the temporary access code. (Col. 2, lines 21-23).

Nowhere does Ala-Laurila teach or suggest an interface, “maintained by the information repository service, configured to receive from an information service provider unaffiliated with the information repository service, (1) information obtained as a result of a search of a website-based information source performed by the information service provider on behalf of a user, and (2) first data identifying the user,” as required by amended claim 41. While Ala-Laurila discloses storing in a subscriber’s mailbox a message “created by a third party,” the third party message does not comprise “information obtained as a result of a search,” as required by amended claim 41. Nor does the third party message contain information obtained from a “website-based information source,” as required by amended claim 41. None of the other cited

art teaches or suggests these limitations, either. Accordingly, amended claim 41 and its dependent claims are patentable over the cited art.

III. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 6, 7, 10-17, 20, 31, 32, 34, 38, 44 and 46-49

Claims 1-5, 6, 7, 10-17, 20, 31, 32, 34, 38, 44 and 46-49 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,888,930 (“Hartselle”). Claims 34, 38, 44, 46-47 and 49 are cancelled. Claims 1, 7, 10-11, 17, 20, 31, 32, and 48 are amended, and the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ala-Laurila is discussed above. Hartselle discloses a method and system that enables a calling party to save for subsequent retrieval and review information obtained from an information retrieval system. (Col. 2, lines 11-15). A calling party places a call to an information retrieval system and obtains desired information. The information retrieval system may comprise, for example, a dial-in service that allows callers to ask for information concerning sports information updates, medical information, driving instructions, etc. (Col. 1, lines 53-58). The caller then selects one or more options to save the information to a memory location for subsequent retrieval and review. (Col. 2, lines 22-26). The information may be sent to and stored at the calling party’s own network-based voice mail system, or at a voice mailbox provided by an information assistance provider. (Col. 2, lines 26-31).

Independent claim 1, as amended, is a method claim that corresponds to system claim 41, discussed above. Accordingly, claim 1 defines a method for use by an information repository service to enable a user to share desired information with one or more parties. Claim 1 has been amended to require “receiving, by an information repository service, from an information service provider unaffiliated with the information repository service, (1) information

obtained as a result of a search of a website-based information source performed by the information service provider on behalf of a user, and (2) first data identifying the user.” Claim 1 has been further amended to require “storing in a repository, by the information repository service, the information received from the information service provider and the first data identifying the user,” and “receiving from the user second data identifying one or more parties authorized to access the information.” Claim 1 has been additionally amended to require “conveying access data enabling access to the information to the one or more parties” and “allowing access by the one or more parties to the information in the repository based on the access data.” Support for the amendments to claim 1 is found at pages 10-14, for example.

Claims 2 and 7-10, which depend from amended claim 1, have been amended to conform to the language of amended claim 1 and also to improve the language of the claims.

As discussed above, Ala-Laurila fails to teach or suggest “receiving, by an information repository service, from an information service provider unaffiliated with the information repository service, (1) information obtained as a result of a search of a website-based information source performed by the information service provider and (2) first data identifying a user.”

Hartselle also does not teach or suggest this limitation, either individually or in combination with Ala-Laurila. While Hartselle discloses receiving and storing information obtained by a calling party from an “information retrieval system,” the information retrieval system is a telephone-based information source, not a website-based information source, as required by amended claim 1. None of the other cited references teach or suggest these limitations, either. Therefore, amended claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable over the cited art.

Independent claims 11, 31, and 48 as amended, recite limitations similar to the limitations of amended claim 1 that are discussed above. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, amended claims 11, 31 and 48, and their dependent claims, are also patentable over the cited art.

Claims 8 and 18

Claims 8 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila in view of Hartselle further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,618,477 (“Lambiase”). Claims 8 and 18 have been amended and the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claims 8 and 18 depend from amended claims 1 and 11, respectively. For the reasons set forth above, amended claims 1 and 11 are patentable over the cited art. Therefore, amended claims 8 and 18 are also patentable over the cited art.

Claims 9 and 19

Claims 9 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila in view of Hartselle further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,292,480 (“May”). Claims 9 and 19 have been amended and the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claims 9 and 19 depend from amended claims 1 and 11, respectively. For the reasons set forth above, amended claims 1 and 11 are patentable over the cited art. Therefore, amended claims 9 and 19 are also patentable over the cited art.

Claims 21-27 and 30

Claims 21-27 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0035501 (“Handel”). Claims 21, 27 and 30 have been amended and the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Handel discloses a system used to facilitate the creation of a web-based user interface. (Abstract). The interface obtains user profile information from a database, gathers information from one or more users regarding product characteristics, correlates user responses, performs statistical analysis of the user responses and presents the statistical analysis. (Paragraph [0006]).

Independent claim 21 has been amended to require, among other limitations, an interface maintained by an information repository service, configured to “receive from an information service provider unaffiliated with the information repository service (1) information obtained as a result of a search of a website-based information source performed by the information service provider on behalf of the user, and (2) the first data.” Support for the amendments to claim 21 is found at pages 10-14, for example. As discussed above, Ala-Laurila does not teach or suggest this limitation.

Handel also fails to teach or suggest this limitation. While Handel discloses a web-based user interface, nowhere does Handel teach or suggest that the interface is “maintained by an information repository service,” and configured to receive, “from an information service provider unaffiliated with the information repository service” information obtained as a result of a search of a website-based information source performed by the information service provider, as required by amended claim 21. Therefore, amended claim 21 and its dependent claims are patentable over the cited art.

Claim 28

Claim 28 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila in view of Handel further in view of Lambiase. Claim 28 has been amended and the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 28 depends from amended claim 21. For the reasons set forth above, amended claim 21 is patentable over the cited art. Therefore, amended claim 28 is also patentable over the cited art.

Claim 29

Claim 29 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila in view of Handel further in view of May. Claim 29 has been amended and the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 29 depends from amended claim 21. For the reasons set forth above, amended claim 21 is patentable over the cited art. Therefore, amended claim 29 is also patentable over the cited art.

IV. New Claims 50-67

New independent claim 50 defines a method to enable a user of a service provider to share information with one or more parties. New claim 50 requires “receiving from a user, by a first information service provider, a request to search a website-based information source,” “performing, by the first information service provider, a search of the information source, generating search results” and “providing to the user, by the first information service provider, an option to store selected search results in an information repository maintained by a second

information service provider different from the first information service provider.” Support for new claim 50 is found at pages 10-14, for example.

For the reasons discussed above, none of the cited art teaches or suggests “receiving from a user, by a first information service provider, a request to search a website-based information source,” “performing, by the first information service provider, a search of the information source, generating search results” and “providing to the user, by the first information service provider, an option to store selected search results in an information repository maintained by a second information service provider different from the first information service provider.” Therefore, new claim 50 is patentable over the cited art.

New claim 51 depends from claim 50 and further requires “receiving, by the first information service provider, a selection of the option by the user, first data identifying the user, and second data associated with the second information service provider” and “providing to the second information service provider, by the first information service provider, selected search results and the first data, in response to the selection of the option.” New claim 51 additionally requires “receiving from the user, by the second information service provider, third data identifying one or more parties intended as recipients of the selected search results” and “allowing, by the second information service provider, the one or more parties to access the selected search results.”

New claim 52 depends from 51 and further recites “wherein the first information service provider comprises a server associated with a website.” New claim 53 depends from claim 51 and further recites “wherein the information source comprises one or more of the following: telephone directory information, map information, event information, transportation information, library catalog information, real estate listing information, product catalog

information, business-to-business swap information, or shopping information.” New claim 54 depends from claim 51 and further recites “wherein the second information service provider comprises an information assistance service.” New claim 55 depends from claim 51 and further recites “wherein the user communicates with the second information service provider by telephone.” New claim 56 depends from claim 51 and further recites “wherein the user communicates with the second information service provider via an internet.” New claim 57 depends from claim 51 and further recites “wherein the second data associated with the second information service provider comprises a uniform resource locator (“URL”) associated with the second information service provider.” New claim 58 depends from claim 51 and further requires “transmitting to the one or more parties, by the second information service provider, access data enabling the one or more parties to access the selected search results.” New claim 59 depends from claim 58 and further recites “wherein the access data comprises one or more items chosen from the group consisting of: a username, a personal identification number (“PIN”), a password, a toll-free telephone number, and a URL.” Support for the new claims 51-59 is found at pages 10-14, for example.

As stated above, new claim 50 is patentable over the cited art. Therefore, its dependent claims 51-59 are also patentable over the cited art.

New independent claim 60 sets forth a method to enable a user of a service provider to share information with one or more parties. New claim 60 requires “transmitting to a first information service provider a request to search a website-based information source,” “receiving from the first information service provider search results responsive to the request,” and “selecting an option to store selected search results in an information repository maintained by a second information service provider different from the first information service provider.”

New claim 60 further requires “providing to the first information service provider first data identifying the user and second data associated with the second information service provider” and “providing to the second information service provider data identifying the user and data identifying one or more parties authorized to receive the selected search results.” Support for new claim 60 is found at pages 10-14, for example.

For the reasons discussed above, none of the cited art teaches or suggests “transmitting to a first information service provider a request to search a website-based information source,” “receiving from the first information service provider search results responsive to the request,” and “selecting an option to store selected search results in an information repository maintained by a second information service provider different from the first information service provider.” Therefore, new claim 60 is patentable over the cited art.

New claim 61 depends from claim 60 and further recites “wherein the first information service provider comprises a server associated with a website.” New claim 62 depends from claim 60 and further recites “wherein the information source comprises one or more of the following: telephone directory information, map information, event information, transportation information, library catalog information, real estate listing information, product catalog information, business-to-business swap information, or shopping information.” New claim 63 depends from claim 60 and further recites “wherein the second information service provider comprises an information assistance service.” New claim 64 depends from claim 60 and further recites “wherein the second data associated with the second information service provider comprises a uniform resource locator (“URL”) associated with the second information service provider.” Support for new claims 60-63 is found at pages 10-14, for example.

As stated above, new claim 60 is patentable over the cited art. Therefore, its dependent claims 61-64 are also patentable over the cited art.

New claim 65 depends from claim 1 and further recites “wherein the information source comprises one or more of the following: telephone directory information, map information, event information, transportation information, library catalog information, real estate listing information, product catalog information, business-to-business swap information, or shopping information.” New claim 66 depends from claim 1 and further recites “wherein the information service provider comprises a server associated with a website.” New claim 67 depends from claim 1 and further recites “wherein the information repository service comprises an information assistance service.” Support for new claims 65-67 is found at pages 10-14, for example.

As stated above, amended claim 1 is patentable over the cited art. Therefore, new claims 65-67 are also patentable over the cited art.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, each of claims 1-32, 41, 45, 48, and 50-67 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of these claims is requested and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Brandon N. Sklar

Reg. No. 31,667

November 01, 2006

Kaye Scholer LLP
425 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10022
(212) 836-8653